

TASK ORDER EVALUATION FORM

Date: 12-20-2016

Contractor Name: Guardian Env. Svcs.

Contract Number: EP S2 15 01

Task Order Number and Site Name: A23Q Niagara Falls Boulevard Site

Period of Performance: April 29, 2015 - Sep. 29, 2016

Brief Description of the Work:

VERBAL AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE REMOVAL ACTION WORK OF RADIOLOGICAL MATERIAL DEPOSITED THROUGHOUT parking lot, building and woods at an active bowling alley and building center property in Niagara Falls, NY.

Location of Work: 9524 & 9540 NIAGARA FALLS BOULEVARD, NIAGARA FALLS, NIAGARA COUNTY, NEW YORK

Names and telephone numbers of Contractor personnel responsible for managing the task order:

GES: PETER JOHNSON (PROGRAM MANAGER 302-803-1472); KEVIN SHAWER (RESPONSE MANAGER 302-518-1910) AND FRANK RODRIGUEZ (Response Manager: 302-803-1191)

1. EMERGENCY RESPONSE:

If this was an emergency response action, did the Contractor's Response Manager and Field Clerk arrive on site within 6 hours of emergency response notification, unless notified otherwise or response is to Puerto Rico/U.S. Virgin Islands?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks:

THIS REMOVAL ACTION WAS A VERBAL AUTHORIZATION FROM THE ERRD DIRECTOR. GES PROVIDED ALL NECESSARY SUPPORT AS REQUESTED by the OSC to initiate removal action. Including a Site visit with the Response Manager. All personnel and equipment arrived when requested. However, 6 hour arrival was not applicable at this site.

2. EMERGENCY RESPONSE:

If this was an emergency response action, did all required personnel, equipment, and materials arrive at the site within 12 hours of emergency response notification, unless notified otherwise or response is to Puerto Rico/U.S. Virgin Islands?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable

Remarks:

3. NON-EMERGENCY RESPONSE:

If this Task Order was a non-emergency response, did the Contractor ensure that all personnel, equipment, and materials arrived at the site within 48 hours of receipt of the Task Order or the start date specified in the Task Order?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks:

THIS REMOVAL ACTION WAS A VERBAL AUTHORIZATION FROM THE ER RD DIRECTOR. GES PROVIDED ALL necessary support as requested by the OSC to initiate removal action. Including a Site visit with the Response Manager.

4. COST ACCOUNTING:

Did the Contractor, utilizing RCMS, track costs and provide accurate, complete, and timely cost accounting reports?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks:

CONSIDERING THE CHALLENGES FACED WHEN STARTING UP A RADIOLOGICAL REMOVAL ACTION WITHIN TWO ACTIVE BUSINESSES, THE FCA SAT the site did a commendable job. However, the site has had four different FCAs in 6 months. This turnaround has caused additional challenges but were eventually overcome by the FCA and the GES financial support staff.

5. COST CONTROL:

Did the Contractor display initiative in controlling overall Task Order costs?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks

THROUGHOUT THE FIRST 6 MONTHS OF THE REMOVAL ACTION, GES STAFF HAS CONTINUOUSLY EVALUATED EXPENSE WHEN THE OSC AND technical staff proposed actions. This is even more important with planning due to the limited amount of funding available to the action memo.

6. SITE SAFETY:

Was the site safety plan developed by the Contractor approved as submitted, or with only one round of revisions necessary?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks

THE SAFETY PLAN WAS DEVELOPED IN A TIMELY MANNER PRIOR TO MOBILIZATION ON JUNE 01, 2016. THIS IS A live document that is ammended when necessary based on new activities.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING:

Did the sampling conducted by the Contractor adhere to all quality assurance, quality control and chain-of-custody procedures specified in the QAPP?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable

Remarks

WESTON CONDUCTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLING SO FAR AT THE NFB SITE. HOWEVER, GES ASSISTED IN excavating sampling pits when needed.

8. SUBCONTRACTING:

Were the Contractor's subcontract consent packages accurate and complete as submitted or required only one revision?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks

THE SUBCONTRACTING AT THE SITE HAS WENT VERY WELL. ALL PACKAGES HAVE BEEN ACCURATED AND SUBMITTED TO potential subs in a timely manner.

9. TRANSPORTATION & DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTE:

Did the Contractor accomplish all storage, transportation, treatment, and disposal of hazardous waste in accordance with the EPA Off-Site rule and all other applicable laws and regulations?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks

WE JUST STARTED TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL AT NFB SITE ON DECEMBER 15, 2016. GES WORKED EXCEPTIONALLY well with the OSC and technical staff in regard to the T&D bid and approval of the disposal profile. This is a very complicated site when it comes to the material being radioactive and a rock-like matrix.

10. CERCLA OFF-SITE DISPOSAL REPORTING:

Did the Contractor submit the CERCLA Off-Site Disposal Reports for each waste stream addressed at the site within 10 calendar days after the contractor received a certificate of disposal for the final waste stream?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable

Remarks

IT HAS ONLY BEEN 5 DAYS SINCE THE FIRST TRUCK LEFT THE SITE TO THE DISPOSAL FACILITY. NO CERTIFICATES HAVE BEEN issued yet.

11. ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE PRACTICES:

Did the Contractor employ environmentally preferable practices at the site?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Remarks

I AM FAMILIAR WITH MOST OF THE GES SITE PERSONNEL AND PROGRAM MANAGER. THEY HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH EPA sites for many years and they always employ environmentally preferable practices at the sites. NFB has been no different.

Eric M. Daly
USEPA Region 02 OSC

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Eric M. Daly", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is cursive and extends slightly above the line.